

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION**

Mark Laun,

Petitioner,

v.

**Orange/L.A. County Sheriff, Orange
County Superior Court**

Respondents.

Case No. 8:18-cv-02226-JVS-KES

Appellate No. G057123

CA Supreme Court No. S259197

Superior Court Nos.:

Orange County 16HF0902

Dismissal -LA County: YA098900

RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF REGARDING MOOTNESS

LEGAL ARGUMENT:

It has been brought up that I no longer am a resident of California and that I now live in Washington State. However, I still travel to California as part of my job as a long-haul truck driver.

Also, the court should consider my right to travel as exposed and explained in *Saenz v. Roe*, 526 U.S. 489 (1999); specifically, about the constitution (and in light of the Federalist Papers):

It protects [1] the right of a citizen of one State to enter and to leave another State, [2] the right to be treated as a welcome visitor rather than an unfriendly alien when temporarily present in the second State, and, [3] for those travelers who elect to become permanent residents, the right to be treated like other citizens of that State.

ARGUMENT FROM MORALITY:

As I was reading through the Brief Regarding Mootness, I pondered this: If I were to present a statement about a fact that I knew to be false, all of us would call that a lie. But, if I were to present a legal argument that I knew to be false, what would we call that?

I considered the possibility that the Deputy Attorney General may have succumbed to a confirmation bias, and that I should try to be charitable. I also considered that I may be dull in my reasoning or ignorant in some way.

But this thing that my appellate attorney Randall Conner told me brings me pause and I hope that all parties would ponder this: that (according to Conner) when some poor individual has been rotting in prison for a decade or more, and that poor soul is later proven innocent by DNA or some other new evidence, that the prosecuting attorneys **ALWAYS** will fight tooth and nail to keep that innocent individual in prison.

I don't understand when a defense attorney helps a guilty and remorseless defendant to escape justice. And to borrow a British phrase, I was gob-smacked when the Irvine PD Detective handling my case responded with "Your case has been adjudicated" when I presented her

with evidence that my ex-wife confessed to causing her own injury in order to gain immigration standing.

These ideas bring us to the application of what we learned from The Milgram Experiment. The experiment (you may know) was intended to help understand the atrocities of WW2 after so many war-crime defendants (particularly Adolf Eichmann) presented the defense “I was just following orders”.

Now, when we talk about the adversarial system, this is very broad topic with many facets, but I don’t think it mandates either a prosecutor or a defender to violate their conscience. I understand that the majority would argue (and continue to argue) against that notion. I have already presented my first argument against it in the lesson from The Milgram Experiment. The second is summarized in:

Proverbs 17:15 “Acquitting the guilty and condemning the innocent — the LORD detests them both.”

AND

Deuteronomy 16:19 “Do not pervert justice or show partiality. Do not accept a bribe, for a bribe blinds the eyes of the wise and twists the words of the innocent.”

The conclusion is the very Gospel message that was preached by Jesus in:

Matthew 4:17 From that time on Jesus began to preach, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is near.”

Plainly speaking, regardless of the country you live in, or the government over you (Rome in 32 A.D.; Germany in 1940; or the United States of America in the present); we are accountable to our Creator to do what is right and just. This is the same idea that is the foundation of our nation as stated in our Declaration of Independence: that God gives rights; or put another way: God determines what is right and what is wrong and our consciences give testimony to that until we dull our conscience with repeated stifling.

With that, I appeal to the Attorney General and his Deputies not to continue their unjust cause toward the perversion of justice, and to concede my innocence.

PLEA FOR CONTINUED INTERPOSITION:

I continue to pray that the Court will interpose on my behalf. As I considered refuting my opponent, I was reminded about the story of the donkey and the tiger in the court of the lion. And in addition, even if I had the stamina and skills to respond point-by-point, I believe it better serves Judicial Economy not to muddy the waters with anything further, but to rely on the experience and discretion of the court, and to continue to plea that the court interpose on my behalf for the cause of justice that is essential for our Nation and our society.

I do hereby swear under penalty of perjury that statements I have made herein are truthful to the best of my knowledge.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ **Mark Laun**
Petitioner
April 3, 2023

Mark Laun
31 Galaxy Lane
Richland, WA 99354
Telephone (cell):714-721-2701
Email: mark@laun.us
In Pro Per

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Case Name: **Laun v. Orange County Sheriff No. EDCV 18-02226 JVS (KES)**

I hereby certify that on April 3, 2023, I electronically filed the following documents with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system:

REPLY TO ANSWER TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the States of California, Washington, and Oregon the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on April 3, 2023, at Haugan, Montana.

/s/ Mark Laun

Mark Laun

In Pro Per

Declarant/Petitioner